



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
P.O. BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440-1022

**COPY MAILED**

**JUL 27 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Appelman :  
Application No. 09/873,272 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: June 5, 2001 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
Attorney Docket No. 06975-054001/Network :  
02 :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed February 13, 2006 and resubmitted March 13, 2006, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional applications set forth in the amendment filed March 13, 2006.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application(s), unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. Since the statement contained in the petition varies from the language required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), the statement contained in the instant petition is being construed as the statement required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3). If this is not a correct interpretation, petitioner should promptly notify the Office.

The petition does not satisfy item (1) above.

The reference to add the prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference prior-filed application no. 09/371,208. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. *See In re deSeversky, supra.* Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Before the petition under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a renewed petition and a substitute amendment or an Application Data Sheet (complying with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121 and 37 CFR 1.76(b)(5)) to correct the above matter is required.

Regarding fees, petitioner filed a \$130.00 petition fee on February 13, 2006. This fee is unnecessary and will be refunded to deposit account no. 06-1050.


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     Customer Service Window  
                                    Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Petitions Attorney Shirene Willis Brantley at (571) 272-3230.

  
Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions